Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner Eric Liou and SPE John W. Hayes for the November 14, 2007, telephone conversation with applicant's attorney.

Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 12 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC § 103(a) as being anticipated by Schwartz et. al., (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0073040).

Schwartz discloses the following in paragraphs 0059 to 0062:

> "[0059] FIG. 7 illustrates postage indicium 700 in accordance with the invention. As shown in FIG. 7, indicium 700 includes human readable portion 705 and bar-code portion 710. Unlike portion 605 of FIG. 6, portion 705 includes human readable transactional data 708 indicating a payment (e.g., $10.00 to a specified payee (e.g., XYZ Co.). As described herein below, like postage 709 (e.g., $0.32), the payment amount (i.e., $10.00) was deducted from the available funds in the descending register in card 180 when indicium 700 was created. Thus, the originator of indicium 700 in this instance expended $10.00 additional postage (i.e., in addition to the $0.32 postage for the cost of delivery of the mail piece on which indicium 700 is applied) in favor of the postal authority. This additional expended amount is to be paid by the postal authority to the payee in a manner to be described.
>
> [0060] Moreover, unlike bar-code portion 610 representing the required postal data and digital signature, portion 710 additionally includes transactional data. However, like portion 610, the data in portion 710 is readable by the postal authority when it uses a conventional bar-code scanner to process the indicium. In accordance with the invention, after learning the transactional data in portion 710, the postal authority pays the specified amount to the payee.
>
> [0061] FIG. 8 illustrates different data fields in bar-code portion 710. In particular, Fields 801a through 801g contain the transactional data in accordance with the invention.
>
> Specifically, field 801a contains data identifying the payer and particularly data identifying the payer account with the payee for proper credit of the payment. For example, the payee, XYZ Co., in this instance is a credit card company.
>
> The payer is a credit card holder who originated indicium 700 to pay his/her credit card balance (e.g., $10.00) in accordance with the

> invention. Thus, in this example, the data in field 801a is most likely the payer's credit card account number.
>
> [0062] Field 801b contains data identifying the payee, and the payee's bank account if a transfer of funds (in this instance in the amount of the credit card balance) by the postal] authority to the payee is anticipated to realize the bill payment. In this instance, the data in field 801b represents the name of the payee and an EFT routing number identifying the payee's bank account."

Schwartz indicium 700 includes a human readable portion 705 and bar code portion 710. Human readable portion 705 includes a postage payment of $0.32 represented by character 709 and a payment of $10.00 to XYZ Co. represented by character 708. The data in portion 710 includes transactional data that in readable by the postal authority.

When the postal authority reads the data in portion 710 it recognizes that at least a part of portion 710 represents money that is due XYZ Co.

The Examiner stated in page 4 of the final Rejection the following:

> "Thus the Examiner interprets bar code 710 to be a second country indicia."

Bar code 710 is a two Dimensional Bar Code that is a portion of Schwartz indicium 700. Indicium 700 is an example of an indicia of a first country i.e. the United States Postal Service (USPS) Indicia.

See the indicium (Digital Postage Mark) appearing in the USPS web site at http://www.usps.com/postagesolutions/abotibip.htm. (A copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A).

Thus Schwartz only discloses one country's indicia namely a USPS indicia.

The Examiner indicating the following in pages 4 and 5 of the Final Rejection.

> "10. The Examiner notes, Schwartz discloses a country post office (Schwartz: Figure 7, "705", "US Postage"; paragraph 0059). Schwartz does not disclose a second country post office.
> However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method of Schwartz to have included a second country post,
> office as disclosed by Schwartz because the post office is one carrier that a customer can select out of many in the competitive mail shipping industry."

The Examiner is incorrect in the above assumption. While it is true that a country post office is one carrier that the customer can select. The country post office selects the other carrier.

For instance if a mailpiece is posted with the United States Postal Service (USPS) for delivery to a destination in the United Kingdom, the USPS will select the Royal Mail to deliver the mailpiece in the United Kingdom and only a U.S. PostageStamp or a U.S. Postal Indicia will appear on the mailpiece. The customer or mailer may not select the post office in the second country.

Thus, Schwartz does not disclose a first country indicia containing a unique number for the payment of carrier fees for a first country post office and a second country indicia containing a number for the payment of carrier fees for a second country post office, as claimed in claim 1.

The Examiner stated the following in pages 5 and 6 of the Final Rejection.

> "14. As per claim 6, Schwartz discloses the method of claim 1 as described above. Schwartz further discloses the first and second indicia are affixed to mail by a personal computer meter (Schwartz: Figure 1; paragraphs 0008; 0023). Schwartz further discloses the use of postage meters to print postage indicia on mail pieces (Schwartz: paragraph 0007). Schwartz does not disclose the indicia are affixed to mail by a postage meter in the secure postage payment method.
>
> 15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method of Schwartz to have included indicia are affixed to mail by a postage meter as disclosed by Schwartz because the postage meter is an effective machine used in the industry to meter mail."
>
> "[0008] In accordance with the invention, a postage payment system incorporating a general purpose computer is capable of securely dispensing postage, and efficiently generating mail pieces. In particular, with the inventive postage payment system, postage indicia are advantageously generated at the same time as mail contents such as letters, invoices, and statements. In accordance with an aspect of the invention, a postage indicium is applied onto a selected location of the mail content. In the preferred embodiment, the mail content is placed into a window envelope such that the postage indicium on the mail content exposes through a window of the envelope to facilitate inspection of the indicium.

> [0023] FIG. 1 illustrates postage payment system 100 embodying the principles of the invention. As shown in FIG. 1, system 100 comprises computer 103 (e.g., a standard PC or workstation), mail processor 150, integrated circuit (IC) card 180, and printer 190 (e.g., a standard inkjet or laser printer). In particular, installed on computer 103 is a mailing application program in accordance with the invention. Also installed on the computer is conventional word processor, billing, accounting and/or other software which, among other things, enables a user to generate mail contents in text and graphics. Computer 103 is connected to mail processor 150.

Schwartz discloses the printing of one postal indicium. Schwartz does not disclose or anticipate the printing of a first country postal indicium and a second country postal indicium with a postage meter as claimed.

Claims 8-10 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz et. al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0073040 in view of Pintsov, U.S. Patent No. 6,125,357.

The Examiner stated the following in page 7 of the Final Rejection.

> "20. Schwartz does not disclose storing indicia information in a database and comparing the information stored in the database with information examined to determine whether the indicia affixed to the examined mail are legitimate.
>
> 21. Pintsov discloses storing indicia information in a database and comparing the information stored in the database with information examined to determine whether the indicia affixed to the examined mail are legitimate (Pintsov: col. 8, lines 18-43).
>
> 22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method of Schwartz to have included storing indicia information in a database and comparing the information stored in the database with information examined to determine whether the indicia affixed to the examined mail are legitimate as disclosed by Pintsov for the advantage of identifying any mail that' may be fraudulent."

Pintsov discloses the following in col. 8, lines 18-43.

> "In a first method verification is performed by verifying the local digital tokens and checking the identifications numbers for duplicates. Using this method, a postal administration may automatically verify the local tokens produced with the postally controlled secret key(s) and thus assure the integrity of the indicium data, but not the address data. If the

> database of the processed indicium ID number is available, the postal administration can then detect duplicates without looking at the address block. This is a traditional verification method.
> FIG. 3 illustrates a flowchart of this verification process. At 50, the indicium is scanned. At 52, the indicium scan is verified using the error detection/correction code 40. At 54, local digital tokens are computed using indicium information from indicium lines 14 and 16. At 56, the local digital tokens are compared to indicium local digital tokeus 32, 34 and 36. At 58, a query is made as to whether the local digital tokens match the indicium local digital tokens. If the local digital tokens do not match, then the suspected fraudulent mail piece is investigated at 60. If the verification process is successful, at 62, the mail piece identification and device identification numbers are compared to identification numbers in a database of identification numbers. At 64, the query is made as to whether the verification is successful. If the verification is not successful, the suspect fraudulent mail piece is investigated at 60. If the verification is successful, the mail piece is delivered at 66."

Pintsov compares the local digital tokens to the indicium digital tokens to verify the indium.

Schwartz and/or Pintsov taken separately or together do not disclose or anticipate examining the first indicia information and the second indicia information: and comparing the information stored in the database with the information examined to determine whether the first indicia. and the second indicia affixed to examined mail are legitimate as claimed in claim 8.

Claim 11 has been rejected by the Examiner as being unpatentable over Schwartz et. al., U. S. Publication No. 2002/0073040 in view of Pintsov, U.S. Patent No. 6,125,357 and further in view of Sansone U.S. Patent No. 6,415,336.

Sansone discloses the following in lines 22-24 of col. 7.

> "FIG. 7c illustrates a "canceled" indicium. As shown, a cancellation mark 146 is produced to deface the FIM symbol, rendering the indicium nonusable."

Sansone only discloses canceling 1 indicium, wherein applicant cancels two indicia.

Please charge any additional fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 16-1885.

In view of the above claims 1-3 and 6-7 and claims 8-12 are patentable. If the Examiner has any questions would the Examiner please call the undersigned at the telephone number noted below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ronald Reichman/
Ronald Reichman
Reg. No. 26,796
Attorney of Record
Telephone (203) 924-3854

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000